

REMARKS

Claims 12 to 16 and 18 to 31 are therefore now pending.

In view of the following, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing claim 31, and for indicating that claims 23 to 30 contain allowable subject matter. While the objections may not be agreed with as to claims 23 to 30, claim 23 has been rewritten as an independent claim so that claims 23 to 30 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objections be withdrawn.

Claims 12 to 16 and 18 to 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

Claims 12 and 21 have been rewritten to address any antecedent basis issues. It is therefore respectfully requested that the indefiniteness rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 12 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as to the written description requirement.

While the rejections may not be agreed with, to facilitate matters, claims 12 and 21 have been rewritten to delete the clause in question (“if the acceleration value in the z direction is below a threshold”), and replace it with the like phrase of “a deployment threshold for generating the trigger signal is elevated as a function of the acceleration in the z direction”, which is specifically disclosed and described on page 4, line 28 to page 5, line 2., as previously explained in the prior amendment. It is therefore respectfully requested that the written description rejections be withdrawn.

Accordingly, claim 12, as presented, is allowable, as are its dependent claims.

Claim 21, as presented, includes features similar to those of claim 12, and it is therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons as claim 12, as presented, as is its dependent claim 22.

In summary, claims 12 to 16 and 18 to 30 are allowable – like allowed claim 31.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, claims 12 to 16 and 18 to 30 are allowable – like allowed claim 31. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections and objections be withdrawn. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: 10/6/2009

By: 

Gerard A. Messina
(Reg. No. 35,952)

One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

Reg. No. 33,805
Amor C. O'Neil